UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. <u>CR 18-0081 (CRB)</u>
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Steven Brown Defendant(s).	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from to and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would See 8 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	d be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the por law, that it is unreasonable to exp	x, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact ect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	I deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, ue diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	I unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time aking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 9/28/18	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney

FEB 28 2018

SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA